



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,071	05/22/2001	Kazuaki Sugai	CANO:027	7600
37013 7590 10/30/2008 ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL, LLP. 20609 Gordon Park Square, Suite 150 Ashburn, VA 20147				
EXAMINER				
KE, PENG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/863,071

Applicant(s)

SUGAI, KAZUAKI

Examiner

SIMON KE

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-9 and 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-9 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 7/25/08.

Claims 1, 5-9, and 13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 are the independent claims. In the amendment, claims 1, 5, 9 and 13 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 6, 8, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz US Patent 6,476,858 in view of Cecco US Patent 6,310,631 further in view of Crow US Patent 6,262,724.

As per claim 5, Ramirez Diaz teaches a multi-window display control apparatus capable of connecting to a video device, the apparatus comprising:

A display control unit that controls a display device to display a plurality of windows including a plurality of video windows (figure 3, item 140) and an operation panel window that is separate and discrete from the video window, (figure 1, items 101-102) at least one of the plurality of the video windows displaying an image based on image data output from the video, and the operation panel window displaying an operation panel for controlling the video device; (figure 1, items 101 and 102)

A selecting unit that selects one of the video windows;

A control unit that controls said display control unit to change a size and a display and a display position of the operation panel window corresponding to the selected one of the video windows in accordance with a changing of a size of the selected one of the video windows. (figure. 4, column 2, lines 50-70, column 7, lines 20-35)

However, they fail to teach all windows have different window sizes.

Cecco teaches a control step of changing a size of each of the windows with the number of the windows kept, where all windows have different window sizes (see figure 5 B, items 6, 7, 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Cecco's teaching with method of Ramirez Diaz in order to allow user to control the size and the number of panes in a window on a display screen.

However, it fails to teach a main window and a plurality of subsidiary video windows having different window sizes and wherein the operation panel window for the main video window displays more operation buttons than the operation panel window for the subsidiary video windows.

Crow teaches a main window and a plurality of subsidiary video windows having different window sizes and wherein the operation panel window for the main video window displays more operation buttons than the operation panel window for the subsidiary video windows. (see Crow, fig. 5, lines 13, lines 55-col. 14, lines 55)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Crow's teaching with apparatus of Ramirez Diaz and Cecco in order allow user to operate on the main window while is still able to monitor secondary activities.

As per claim 6, Ramirez Diaz, Cecco, and Crow teach a multi-window display control apparatus as claimed in claim 5. Ramirez Diaz further teaches said control unit controls said display control unit to change sizes of operating buttons included in the operating panel window in accordance with the changing of the size of the selected one of the video windows. (Figure 4, The operating buttons of the two left windows are larger than the operating buttons of the 8 right windows)

As per claim 8, Ramirez Diaz, Cecco, and Crow teaches a multi-window display control apparatus as claimed in claim 5, wherein said control unit controls said display control unit to change display position and sizes of all of the video windows and the operation panel window that are being displayed, in accordance with the changing of the size of the selected one of the video windows. (column 7, lines 5-35)

As per claim 13, it is rejected with the same rationale claim 5. *Supra*.

Claims 1, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz US Patent 6,476,858 in view of Martinez US Patent 6,111,575 further in view of Cecco et al. US Patent 6,310,631 further in view Bormann US Patent 6,664,985.

As per claim 1, Ramirez Diaz teaches a multi-window display control apparatus comprising:

An input unit that input digital video data from a plurality of digital video sources; (see Ramirez, fig. 7, items 4a, 4x)

A display control unit that controls a display device to display a plurality of windows in a display screen of the display device; (figure 3, item 140; figure 1, items 101 and 102) corresponding to the digital video data from the plurality of video sources, the plurality of video windows. (see Ramirez, fig. 7, items 4a, 4x)

A selecting unit that selects one of the windows; (figure 2, item 103)

A control unit that responses to the selection of a window by said selecting unit, for controlling said display control unit to change a size of each of the windows based on the selection information. (figure. 4, column 2, lines 50-70, column 7, lines 20-35)

However, Ramirez Diaz fails to teach a storage that stores selection history information for each of the windows selected by said selecting unit;

Martinez teaches a storage that stores selection history information for each of the windows selected by said selecting unit; (see Martinez, column 8, lines 30-60; User's interaction with the application is selection history.)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Martinez's teaching with method of Ramirez Diaz in order to allow a user to perform multiple levels of undo and redo at a time.

However, they fail to teach a control step of changing the size of each of the windows with the number of the windows kept.

Cecco teaches a control step of changing a size of each of the windows with the number of the windows kept. (see Cecco. Col. 4 ,lines 40-60)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Cecco's teaching with method of Ramirez Diaz and Martinez in order to allow user to control the size and the number of panes in a window on a display screen.

However, they fail to teach a main window and a plurality of subsidiary video windows having different window sizes and determine display positions and sizes of the video windows such that none of the video windows overlap with each other, and such that a more recent selected digital video data is displayed at a larger display area than a previously selected video data, which is displayed at a smaller display area.

Bormann teaches a main window and a plurality of subsidiary video windows having different window sizes and determine display positions and sizes of the video windows such that none of the video windows overlap with each other, and such that a more recent selected digital video data is displayed at a larger display area than a previously selected video data, which is displayed at a smaller display area. (see Crow fig. 5, lines 13, lines 55-col. 14, lines 55)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Crow's teaching with apparatus of Ramirez Diaz, Martinez, and Cecco in order allow user to operate on the main window while is still able to monitor secondary activities.

As per claim 9, it is rejected with the same rationale claim 1. Supra

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz US Patent 6,476,858 in view of Cecco US Patent 6,310,631 further in view of Crow US Patent 6,262,724 further in view of Ishida US Patent 5,684,969.

As per claim 7, Ramirez Diaz, Cecco, and Crow teach a multi-window system as claimed in claim 5. However they fail to teach wherein said control unit controls said display control unit to change numbers of operating buttons included in the operation panel windows in accordance with the changing of the size of the selected one of the video windows.

Ishida teaches wherein control unit controls display control unit to change numbers of operating buttons included in the operation panel windows in accordance with the changing of the size of the selected one of the video windows. (column 8, lines 26-64)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ishida's teaching with method of Ramirez Diaz, Cecco, and Crow in order display all the general information in a single display.

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-9, and 13 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIMON KE whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke
/Peng Ke/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174